In re Appln. of GILIBERTO et al. Appln. No. 09/556,567

## REMARKS

Claims 2-9 are presently pending in this application. Claims 2-4 and 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by "Specification of the BLUETOOTH System Profiles Version 1.0B")(hereinafter "Profiles"). Claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Profiles in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,041,075 to Caushik.

## **Interview Summary**

An interview was held on September 16, 2003, between Phillip Pippenger (applicants' representative) and Examiner George C. Neurauter. The discussion focused primarily on the application of Profiles to claims 2–4. During the interview, it was noted in the course of discussion that Profiles does not disclose a method that determines whether or not a remote device is a dial-up device, in order to specifically provide variable behavior accordingly. Additionally, with regard to claims 4–9, it was noted that Profiles specifically states that it does not explicitly address the issue of how to use a "Bluetooth-aware helper application" to communicate with legacy applications. Examiner Neurauter indicated that further consideration would be warranted in view of the discussion, and scheduled an additional interview for the following week.

A second interview was held on September 25, 2003, between Mr. Pippenger and Examiner Neurauter. Examiner Neurauter indicated that claims 2 and 3 would be reconsidered if it was made more clear that the method determines whether or not the remote device is a dial-up networking device, and varies behavior accordingly. Examiner Neurauter further indicated that claims 4-9 would be reconsidered if it was made more clear that the method takes place in the context of using a helper component to communicate with legacy applications.

Applicants are grateful for the Examiner's time and guidance, and have amended the claims in keeping with the Examiner's comments.

In re Appln. of GILIBERTO et al. Appln. No. 09/556,567

## **CONCLUSION**

The application is now considered to be in good and proper form for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a further telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Phillip Pippenger, Reg. No. 46,055

One of the Attorneys for Applicants LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.

Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900

180 North Stetson

Chicago, Illinois 60601-6780

(312) 616-5600 (telephone)

(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: September 29, 2003